



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

A 'people's viceroyalty'? Popularity, theatre and executive politics 1835-47

Gray, P. (2012). A 'people's viceroyalty'? Popularity, theatre and executive politics 1835-47. In P. Gray, & O. Purdue (Eds.), *The Irish Lord Lieutenantcy, c. 1541-1922* (pp. 158-178). University College Dublin Press.

Published in:

The Irish Lord Lieutenantcy, c.1541-1922

Document Version:

Early version, also known as pre-print

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

The Irish Lord Lieutenancy

C. 1541–1922

edited by

PETER GRAY AND OLWEN PURDUE



UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN PRESS
PREAS CHOLÁISTE OLLSCOILE
BHAILE ÁTHA CLIATH

First published 2012
by University College Dublin Press
Newman House
86 St Stephen's Green
Dublin 2
Ireland

www.ucdpress.ie

© the editors and contributors, 2012

ISBN 978-1-906359-60-7

All rights reserved. No part of this publication
may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise
without the prior permission of the publisher.

Cataloguing in Publication data available from the British Library

Typeset in UK in Plantin and Fournier by Ryan Shiels
Text design by Lyn Davies
Printed on acid-free paper in England by Antony Rowe,
Chippenham, Wilts

A 'People's Vicerealty'? Popularity, Theatre and Executive Politics 1835–47



Peter Gray

The Irish lord lieutenantcy uneasily combined two roles – the headship of the executive government of Ireland and the office of viceroy, representing the person of the monarch at the apex of the Irish court. This dual position may always have been replete with tension; as the monarch's minister as well as his personal representative, the lord lieutenant was the agent of the governing ministry at Westminster, while simultaneously being expected to play a courtly role elevated above partisanship. Individual temperament led some holders of the office to emphasise one aspect over the other, and the fluctuating balance of executive experience and assertiveness between the lord lieutenant, chief secretary and home secretary frequently tilted the balance between the two. Others sought, with varying degrees of success, to exploit the elevated status of the vicerealty to advance the political agenda of their lord lieutenantcy. Periods of intense partisan polarisation in Dublin or Westminster, Irish political unrest, or strains in British-Irish relations tended also to highlight the ambiguities inherent in the office and to stir up debate about its very utility.¹ The 1830s–40s was one such period.

Both aspects of the lord lieutenantcy posed problems for the institution's public popularity in Ireland during the nineteenth century. As the personification of both the ministry and the British Crown, the name and activities of the lord lieutenant were widely reported through the island through proclamations, the press and pamphlets as well as popular ballads and oral transmission. Residents of Dublin and its environs were most likely to have direct experience of his presence, not least through observation of the public pomp and ceremonial of viceregal reviews, processions and public entertainments. Lavish expenditure surrounding the viceregal court made many Dubliners defensive of the institution (especially in the wake of the reduction of aristocratic spending in the city after the Act of Union), but did not necessarily endear them to the office-holder or his politics. Beyond the capital, where the person of the lord lieutenant might only be observed

during occasional provincial visits and reminders of his existence were manifested most frequently through his signature on proclamations announcing some new measure of coercion, indifference or hostility to both the office and its bearer was more likely, at least below the level of the local Protestant elite. As the fount of Irish political patronage, apogee of the Dublin court and representative of the monarch the lord lieutenant tended at least to command the respect of the bulk of the ascendancy class, though not without an admixture of suspicion arising from his perceived subservience to the British administration, even if a Tory one, and resentment on the part of disappointed patronage-seekers. Although generally 'managed' in the early nineteenth century by the powerful coterie of conservative Protestant officials at the Castle (most notably the long-serving William Gregory, under-secretary 1812–30), there remained a concern that English lords lieutenant were ultimately loyal to the interests of London rather than to the ascendancy, and that the 'Castle clique' of Irish Protestant officials held place only by viceregal sufferance.

For these reasons, the idea of a 'popular' viceroyalty in nineteenth-century Ireland seems an unlikely one. Nevertheless, the subject of this paper is the concerted attempt from the mid-1830s to popularise the institution, utilising both its 'decorative' and 'efficient' elements in an attempt to articulate and implement a popular liberal-unionist political project. This initiative, forming part of the broader 'justice to Ireland' policy agenda of the second Melbourne government, was remarkably successful, albeit temporarily and at a price – the thorough-going alienation of much of the landed and clerical establishment. Through his flamboyant and frequently theatrical efforts, the second earl of Mulgrave rendered himself the most popular lord lieutenant in the institution's history, while simultaneously making himself the most loathed in the eyes of its traditional defenders and associates. Mulgrave was not the first to seek to redefine the office through popularisation – but previous attempts (for example under Fitzwilliam in 1795, Bedford in 1806, Wellesley in 1821 and Anglesey in 1829) had been short-lived or half-hearted. Nor was he the last; his Whig successors Viscount Ebrington in 1839–41 and the fourth earl of Bessborough in 1846–7, also sought, but with more mixed success, to promote 'justice to Ireland' from the Viceregal Lodge and appeal beyond the confines of the Dublin court to the mass of the Irish population.

The novel tenor of the Mulgrave viceroyalty was dramatised by the new lord lieutenant's inaugural entry to Dublin in May 1835. As was customary, the event was marked by military display and a formal (albeit chilly) official welcome from the office-holders of Dublin Corporation. What distinguished this episode was both the viceroy's behaviour and the public's response. Having first been met by a delegation of liberal peers at Kingston pier, Mulgrave proceeded to the city on horseback, accompanied by a procession

estimated at swelling to 120,000 strong, led by the trades union of Dublin and observed by even larger crowds expressing noisy enthusiasm. 'Some excellent amateur bands', playing 'national airs', accompanied the raucous procession to the capital. Controversy arose immediately from the participation of the radical trades and the green banners and placards displayed along the route and in the new viceroy's train, including texts such as 'The friend of your king and of the people', 'Justice' and 'A Free People', along with other trades' banners allegedly making reference to repeal of the Union (there was some suggestion that pro-Mulgrave inscriptions patched onto older placards had washed off in the heavy rain).²

For his part, Mulgrave played the part of the triumphal hero; despite the rain, he 'remained uncovered nearly the entire way, kindly acknowledging the salutations and cheers of the crowd as he proceeded'. An unofficial ceremony in his presence saw the radical orator Marcus Costello rename a new bridge 'Mulgrave Bridge', in defiance of the corporation's recent decision to name it after the previous Tory viceroy.³ Irish Tories immediately reacted in print and in parliament, denouncing Mulgrave's followers as a 'rabble', identified the banners displayed as those of the Ribbonmen and O'Connellites, and demanded Mulgrave's prosecution under the party processions act, while the government papers preferred to interpret the predominant sentiment as one of a 'deep feeling of loyalty to the king, and affectionate respect for their sovereign's representative'.⁴ From its inception it was clear that this vicerealty would be intensely divisive and that Mulgrave's personal style, as much as the policies his administration adopted, would play a role in stoking both enthusiasm and repulsion.

Mulgrave's popular reception in May 1835 was made possible by a significant political realignment in the preceding months, itself dependent on the outcome of factional conflicts within the Whig-Liberal party. Earl Grey's administration of 1830-4 had pursued an ambiguous policy in Ireland, combining moderate reformist initiatives on education, public works and the established Church with the use of coercion against social and political agitation, while demonstrating reluctance to jettison traditional ruling cadres in the Castle administration and senior legal offices. Particularly during Edward Stanley's period as chief secretary, relations with Daniel O'Connell had been very poor, as the anti-tithe and repeal agitations had pitted the forces of the state against those of popular politics in much of the country. Grey's viceroys, the marquess of Anglesey and Marquess Wellesley, had both previously held that office under Tory administrations and, while both supporters of Catholic emancipation, lacked both the popular touch and much inclination to treat constructively with O'Connell as leader of the 'popular' party in the country.⁵ Mulgrave's propagandists were quick to contrast their failure with the new beginning in 1835.⁶

The appropriation issue, pressed in the cabinet in spring 1834 by Lord John Russell, famously 'upset the reform coach' and led to secession of the 'Derby Dilly' Whig moderates (including Stanley) followed by the resignation of Grey himself. Melbourne's succeeding ministry was more forward on Irish policy, but it was not until the dismissal of the government by the king in late 1834, and its reformulation on the fall of Peel's short-lived ministry in April 1835 that the full consequences of this became manifest. Peter Mandler has characterised the 'Foxite Whig' faction, led by Russell, which emerged predominant from this period of upheaval, as marked both by a style of aristocratic populism and by a genuine commitment to thorough (albeit non-democratic) reform in the domestic sphere. Unusually for any group of British politicians, Ireland held a certain fascination and was a high political priority for the Foxites, and from 1835, with Russell at the home office, they both dominated Irish-related offices of state and dictated that reform of Irish tithes, municipal corporations, justice, poor relief and the franchise would be at the head of the incoming government's legislative agenda.⁷ Preparatory to the ousting of the Peel administration, the Foxite Whigs negotiated the so-called 'Lichfield House compact' with O'Connell and the British radicals, ostensibly on the shibboleth of the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Irish Church, but more substantially on a commitment to a thorough-going revolution in Irish governing practice as well as substantive reforming legislation.

Lichfield House, and O'Connell's subsequent commitment to a Whig alliance he believed best calculated to advance his own political objectives in Ireland at that time, thus paved the way for Mulgrave's reception in Dublin. Indeed the 'Liberator' assured his allies that on arrival the new lord lieutenant would 'get nothing but strength and comfort and confidence from the popular party'. Privately he praised the choice of Mulgrave as an ideal lord lieutenant, while expressing his consciousness that too close a public association with him might prove counterproductive for both parties.⁸ For his part, Mulgrave had fewer qualms, and soon courted controversy with moderate Irish and British Whigs, and more ominously aroused the anger of the king, by inviting O'Connell to dinner at the Viceroyal Lodge and to levees at Dublin Castle. However, he had the support of the home secretary in doing so, and, after 1837 was even emulated by the new queen in publicly receiving the much-demonised Irish leader.⁹

It does not follow, however, that Tory claims that 'O'Mulgrave' was merely the subservient tool of the manipulative Irish agitator were correct.¹⁰ The Whigs and O'Connell sought to advance their separate, if overlapping, agendas through pragmatic collaboration in the face of a common enemy; this involved some sacrifice on O'Connell's part, suspending the popular campaign for repeal in return for substantive reforms and a sympathetic

patronage regime – ‘I have thrown away . . . my “talisman” – the Repeal’, he observed in late 1834, and the size of his ‘tail’ of loyal MPs fell in subsequent elections to 1841.¹¹ At the same time the pact encumbered the Whigs with an easily caricatured connection with a man many in Britain regarded as a seditious demagogue, a heretical church and a barbarous populace, damaging them at the British (although not the Irish) polls.¹²

Political calculation played its part in the O’Connell-Whig alliance, but so also did political idealism, at least on the part of many of its Whig advocates, and also the bonds of personal trust. The latter element emanated principally from the genuine friendship between O’Connell and Lord Duncannon, heir to a County Kilkenny estate, an Irish earldom and headship of the ‘patriot’ Ponsonby family, and from the 1820s a key political organiser for the Whig-Liberal party and mainstay of the Foxite political grouping. Duncannon was the principal architect of Lichfield House – having begun detailed negotiations with O’Connell on an electoral pact in November 1834.¹³ Duncannon also hosted Russell’s fact-finding visit to Ireland in 1833 and was a key adviser to both the Mulgrave and Ebrington viceroynalties. He was subsequently the shaper of Foxite Irish policy in the 1830s and, as fourth earl of Bessborough, was himself viceroy in 1846–7, when he (along with O’Connell) sought in vain to revive the politics of 1835 in a much more hostile political and economic context.¹⁴

Mulgrave was an inspired choice for the first Foxite viceroy of Ireland. The son of a Tory cabinet minister, he exhibited the seal of the political convert. After making his earliest parliamentary speeches in support of Catholic Emancipation and parliamentary reform, he attached himself to Russell’s circle, and was rewarded with appointment as governor of Jamaica in 1832 followed by the cabinet post of lord privy seal in 1834. His enthusiasms were not restricted to the political. He spent much of the 1820s resident in Tuscany, and devoted much of his energy there to theatrical and other cultural pursuits.¹⁵ He was well known as a writer of fiction, publishing four romantic novels between 1825 and 1832, which attracted mixed reviews.¹⁶ Returning to London, Mulgrave vigorously patronised the theatre, chairing the Drury Lane Theatrical Fund dinners in 1832 and 1835.¹⁷ He carried this enthusiasm with him to Dublin, where he promoted both Rossini’s operas and burlesque amateur theatricals.¹⁸ The theatre in Dublin, however, embodied a political as well as a cultural dimension. Visits by previous viceroys had witnessed more intense drama around the viceregal box than on the stage, with Marquess Wellesley’s December 1822 appearance sparking the infamous ‘bottle riot’ by Orangemen infuriated by his banning of the decoration of King William’s statue on College Green, while Lord Haddington’s in early 1835 had attracted attention by the provocative display of Orange paraphernalia in the box behind the lord lieutenant’s head (albeit without his

advance knowledge).¹⁹ Lord and Lady Mulgrave's first visit to the Dublin theatre in May 1835 saw partisan disturbances in the stalls resulting in the appropriation of the auditorium space by his supporters, followed by 'the most enthusiastic plaudits of certainly the most dense assemblage [. . .] ever witnessed in a Dublin theatre' – these of course were directed at the viceroy rather than the performers.²⁰ For their part, 'the lord lieutenant and his lady carried off their roles remarkably well', noted a visiting diarist, 'bowing gracefully, and with apparent feeling, to the congratulation of the audience'.²¹

The politics of space and display were not restricted to the theatre. Although the viceroy had earlier been concerned that any encouragement of the 'day of license' that was St Patrick's Day might be used against the government, in 1837 large numbers of the public were admitted to Upper Castle Yard to hear military bands play Irish airs (including 'St Patrick's Day' and 'Garryowen'), witness the changing of the guard and cheer Mulgrave and members of the viceregal family, several of whom were adorned in green costume for the occasion.²² This 'wearing of the green', both sartorially and rhetorically, was to be a particular trait of his regime. This was not entirely new; Bedford had revived the observance of St Patrick's Day in 1806, and both Wellesley and Anglesey had engaged in similar 'patriotic' displays, but Mulgrave took such emblematic activities to new lengths.²³ Moreover, with much of the Anglo-Irish gentry now boycotting the viceregal court, the focus of his attention was decidedly on the 'public' rather than the traditional courtly sphere of muted 'patriotism'.

Mulgrave's taste for the theatrical provided plentiful ammunition for his political opponents, and has tended to shape historical interpretations of his Irish administration. From R. R. Madden, writing in the mid-1840s, onwards, there has been a pattern of identifying the talented but sober under-secretary Thomas Drummond rather than his flamboyant aristocratic superiors as the moving genius of reforming government in Ireland. Perhaps as a consequence of his having died in office in 1840, and acquiring admiring biographers (John Ferguson McLennan in 1867, R. Barry O'Brien in 1889), Drummond has tended to be elevated in historical memory, while his political chiefs Mulgrave and the chief secretary Lord Morpeth suffered from the oscillations of their subsequent political careers and lacked nineteenth-century biographies.²⁴ Unquestionably popular (as demonstrated by the public obsequies in Ireland following his premature death), highly capable, and with an acute and extensive knowledge of Irish conditions, Drummond was an indispensable member of the administrative team, but it is frequently overlooked that he was a subordinate official and rarely the initiator as opposed to the executor of its public policy. Responsibility for the success or failure of the 1835–41 Irish government lay with the lord lieutenant, and secondarily with the chief

secretary – the overemphasis on Drummond may reflect a historiographical preference for the bourgeois (and perhaps Scottish) virtues of professionalism and administrative efficiency over those of a more effervescent aristocratic political populism.²⁵

If Mulgrave owed his initially favourable reception by ‘popular’ opinion in Ireland to O’Connell’s goodwill, he was also in large part the architect of his own public persona. Dublin Castle projected his image through the use of favourable newspapers (especially the *Dublin Evening Post*) and regular periodical articles – Drummond commissioned at least six such eulogies for insertion in the newly-established *Dublin Review* (which was part-owned by O’Connell himself) in 1836–8 as well as two for the *Edinburgh*. Mulgrave’s previous Jamaican experience was put to particularly good use as an emblem of the emancipatory moment he and Russell envisaged his vicerealty as signifying for Ireland.²⁶ The fact that he had presided there over the implementation of the 1833 slavery abolition act was repeatedly enthused on in addresses to the viceroy, in his responses and in liberal commentary. In one of his earliest public responses, to a rather half-hearted address of welcome from Trinity College (where he had been ‘groaned’ at by the students), Mulgrave commented that ‘it requires to have seen men slaves, fully to appreciate the happiness of leaving them free’.²⁷ In Belfast, where the abolitionist movement had been particularly active, liberals drummed up enthusiasm for Mulgrave’s visit in 1835 by highlighting this element of his personal narrative.²⁸ Despite sectarian tensions and municipal hostility, the viceroy’s visit to the town in October appears to have been a popular success, at least among the Catholic and large sections of the Presbyterian population, who feted him in the town’s theatre (suitably enough). His statement that, while he came as the king’s impartial representative, he believed that Ireland must be governed through the power of its ‘public opinion’, was particularly well received.²⁹ His anti-slavery record also played well with liberal unionists suspicious of O’Connellism – both the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster and the Seceding Synod congratulated Mulgrave on his appointment, making special reference to his ‘conspicuous part’ in the abolition of slavery as grounds for expressing confidence in his reforming administration of Ireland.³⁰

The exchange of public addresses and viceregal responses was an important part of Mulgrave’s public projection, especially as it was associated with the series of provincial tours he began shortly after arrival. Given the Whig government’s commitment to radically reform the Irish municipal corporations, it is not surprising that addresses from the established corporate bodies tended to be curt and formulaic, or that many of these Tory-dominated bodies declined to issue invitations to the viceroy. Their place was taken (or rival addresses were prepared) by more informal parish, town and county meetings, or by voluntary associations. Of the 200 Irish addresses to Mulgrave

collected and published together in 1836, eleven were from corporations, 120 from parishes and towns, and twenty-six drawn up by county or baronial meetings. Twenty-one came from Catholic clerical bodies, five from Presbyterians, one from a Wesleyan congregation in Donegal and none (hardly surprisingly) from the established Church. The contents of the addresses varied, but many were the product of local political organisation and combined professions of loyalty to the lord lieutenant and the monarch he represented with explicit demands for 'equality', especially in the administration of justice, and speedy implementation of Irish reforms. While careful to avoid sounding excessively partisan, Mulgrave's published answers were clearly sympathetic to such aspirations, again to the outrage of Conservative commentators.

Mulgrave's annual progresses throughout the island appear to have been much more extensive than those of his predecessors (who tended to regard them 'with undisguised horror'), and served a number of purposes.³¹ At one level these were 'fact-finding' visits, to appraise the lord lieutenant of both local conditions and grievances. There is evidence that he took this responsibility seriously and that it informed policy-making. Mulgrave was the first lord lieutenant since the Union to visit County Donegal; he took the opportunity to report in detail to London on the social distress he witnessed there and provided a radical anti-landlordist social commentary as an interpretive gloss.³² His personal efforts to investigate and alleviate local famine conditions further bolstered his local popularity, and was contrasted with the distant formality of his predecessors.³³

The tours were also highly political, bolstering support for liberal and radical political interests in the localities and providing the lord lieutenant with the opportunity of engaging in the politics of spectacle before fresh audiences. The streets of towns he visited were frequently decorated with 'green boughs' and triumphal arches – such as that across the highway at Drumsna, County Leitrim, emblazoned 'Long live Lord Mulgrave, the Impartial Viceroy' and 'Justice to Ireland' – setting the scene for the politics of public gesture.³⁴ The viceroy appears to have enjoyed the lionising he received in the provinces, writing to Russell from Wexford that 'nobody who has not seen the wonderful outpouring of an Irish population of all ranks can have any idea of it'.³⁵ While Tory papers dismissed such scenes as the result of priestly rabble-rousing, the extent of popular excitement during these tours in the west and south, in the face of the hostility of the bulk of the gentry, could not be gainsaid.³⁶

One of the most controversial aspects of Mulgrave's viceroyalty was his use of the prerogative power of clemency to mitigate sentences or release prisoners. This was in itself nothing new – the prerogative power had been widely used by previous incumbents and, as the liberal press pointed out,

had actually been resorted to for larger numbers under Tory governments. Again, what marked out Mulgrave's regime was the very personal and direct mode with which this power was used. Some of the acts of clemency, such as the remission of Thomas Reynold's sentence for sedition in 1836, were explicitly political (in response to the perceived partisanship in his conviction and sentencing);³⁷ but others were more concerned with 'popularising' the administration of justice through a more arbitrary display of mercy to lesser malefactors. At Clonmel Gaol in August 1836, he ordered the release of fifty-seven prisoners; this was a risky proceeding given that each reoffending case was enthusiastically leapt on by his enemies.³⁸ In several instances Mulgrave staged public reconciliations between those convicted of faction fighting, while threatening vigorous prosecution of future such offences; at Carrick on Shannon the same month thirty-six men convicted of rioting were set free: 'Well then, boys,' he is reported as saying on hearing their profession to keep the peace in future, 'I accept your pledge – walk out'.³⁹ While hotly contested by his opponents, liberal writers hailed the positive consequences of this exercise of clemency, combined with moves towards the de-sectarianisation of policing and justice, as a personal triumph: 'Tipperary is deeply indebted for this remarkable improvement to the personal exertions of Lord Mulgrave . . .', wrote one pamphleteer, 'He visited the disturbed districts, and claimed in person the cooperation of the well-disposed of all classes in his exertions to restore order'.⁴⁰ Justifying himself against charges that the policy of clemency had been recklessly pursued, and had encouraged crime, Mulgrave insisted that close attention had been paid to the character, situation and nature of the offence in all cases, that leniency had been shown to those of all religious and political opinions, and that in general the policy was justified by the general tendency of Irish courts to impose excessive sentences.⁴¹ The Irish crime statistics in the period were the subject of vituperative claim and counter-claim, but they appear generally to support the Whig contention that agrarian and political crime had fallen, and suggest that the drive to popularise the legal structures of Ireland was not without some success. While fully supported by his allies, however, Mulgrave's flamboyant style and manifestation of viceregal autonomy in this sphere concerned the more moderate prime minister, Viscount Melbourne, who felt privately that his pardons and progresses were 'too like the acts of an absolute sovereign and not in the character of a constitutional government'.⁴²

While Mulgrave's chief cheerleaders were to be found among the liberal middle classes of Ireland, there is some evidence of genuine popularity, beyond the reports of cheering crowds drawn from the lower levels of Irish society. One surviving chapbook produced in the period, a text that was cheaply produced and probably widely circulated, accompanied a misogynist ballad on female entrapment of young men with a panegyric on 'Earl

Mulgrave's welcome to Waterford'. The verses stressing the key themes of the O' Connellite alliance, Mulgrave's emancipatory record in Jamaica and Ireland, viceregal patronage of local manufactures, and (of course) the importance of drinking his excellency's health. The vicereine's patronage of Irish products and display of Irish patriotic emblems was also singled out for praise:

You injured sons of Erin draw near until my theme
While I relate the praise of this worthy man of fame
Our noble Lord Lieutenant he is O'Connell's friend
And to regain our long lost rights is what he does intend.

CHORUS

It's what he does intend, it's what he does intend,
And to regain our long lost rights is what he does intend.

His visit into Waterford it was a glorious sight to see
Men of every rank and station they all now did agree
With heart and hand in unity their country for too free,
With colours fine he seemed inclined to be welcome here with green.

A new hope has sprung up for Erin and that you'll shortly see
If we but join our hearts together in love and unity
Sure our present Lord Lieutenant he ruled the Indian shore,
He repailed, the slaves broke off their chains, his loss they do deplore.

...

To encourage Irish manufacture his lady now she goes
And wears the shamrock on her breast it's seen in beaten gold.
Attended by each noble so splendid there she's seen
At each ball and assembly decorated all with green.

...

I wish I was endowed with learning or could direct my quill,
The praise of his Excellency some pages it would fill
Come fill up your flowing bumpers and drink with alacrity,
And toast to brave O'Connell and his Excellency.⁴³

More 'respectable' demotic expressions of support came from the trades of the cities of Cork and Limerick and the Cork Mechanics Institute.⁴⁴ I have yet to discover, however, whether the reported call by a chairman of an O'Connell dinner that Irish mothers should christen one of their sons 'Mulgrave' has any effect on popular naming practices in the later 1830s.⁴⁵

The legislative strategy of the 1835–9 administration was largely outside Mulgrave's hands, although he and his colleagues in Dublin Castle were consulted on the drafting of Irish legislation.⁴⁶ He was expected, however, to manage the anticipated negative reaction in Ireland to the continued rejection or belated and watered-down passage of the tithe and municipal reform measures. Patronage and appointment policy, the fields most firmly in the lord lieutenant's hands, were vigorously employed to promote 'popular' (frequently, but by no means predominantly Catholic) candidates to law offices, the magistracy and the administration and dismiss those overtly associated with Orange demonstrations.⁴⁷ Senior appointments in the reformed and centralised Irish Constabulary were also retained by the Castle, a fact which led to the resignation of the force's commander, Col. Shaw Kennedy, although he declined to condemn the appointments made when questioned by a parliamentary committee. The marked overlap between the appointments and those advocated by O'Connell inevitably opened the administration up to Conservative attack, although claims that they were made at the Irish agitator's dictation were untrue, and by 1841 only around one third of all judicial and administrative offices under the Crown were held by anti-Tories, and less than half of these were Catholics.⁴⁸ Mulgrave defended himself in person to the Lords on this key point:

I fearlessly and utterly deny that the Government has been controlled by Mr O'Connell, or has consulted with Mr O'Connell as to any of the appointments that have been made; and as to the charge of the Government having the steady support of Mr O'Connell, I honestly confess that that is a circumstance, considering how much he carries with him the hearts and affections of the Irish people, that I can regard only as a great advantage, and as one that ought not to be made a matter of reproach. But that Mr O'Connell influences me – that he actuates me in the discharge of my duties, or that I am governed or actuated by any other than my own sense of right, I utterly and totally deny in the face of your Lordships, and of the noble Lord by whom the charge was brought forward.⁴⁹

The executive decision to reject applications for the use of the police to enforce the collection of tithes and rent, and to publicly refuse the demand from local elites for the introduction of coercive measures (as manifest in Drummond's 1838 letter to the Tipperary magistrates, written at Mulgrave's direction), proved equally controversial.⁵⁰

The price of Mulgrave's popularity amongst Catholics and liberal Protestants in Ireland was an intense degree of antagonism manifested against him throughout and indeed after his period in Dublin. Not only were the Conservative papers in both islands replete with hostile reports and leaders in virtually every issue, peers and MPs regularly initiated censure

motions, which were particularly dangerous given the opposition majority in the Lords. This climaxed in 1839 when infuriated Irish Tories, led by Lord Roden, succeeded in initiating a full-scale parliamentary inquiry into his administration. The marquess of Normanby (as Mulgrave became on his promotion in the coronation honours of June 1838) was present to defend himself in the debates surrounding this motion, but had expressed dismay that the Whig leaders in the Lords had made only ineffective efforts to do so on previous occasions.⁵¹ Unhappiness at his political exposure, along with his political ambition to return to the cabinet and growing weariness of the tedium of viceregal functions, eventually led to his decision to leave Ireland.⁵² Lord Glenelg's resignation as colonial secretary in early 1839 provided the desired opportunity, and Normanby left Dublin after nearly four years, convinced that he had succeeded in attaining the objective set out in 1835 of establishing general tranquillity without resort to coercion.

While less boisterous than the viceregal arrival in 1835, the departure of the Normanbys in February 1839 was also marked not only by the usual formalities, but by public displays of emotion, effusive addresses from Dublin, Belfast and many other places, and a procession to Kingston that 'far eclipsed' that of his predecessors in 'numbers, respectability, without saying anything of popular enthusiasm'. The viceregal couple were reported to be moved to tears by the scenes they witnessed.⁵³ Only Russell's father, the duke of Bedford, in 1807, and Anglesey at the end of his first viceroyalty in 1829 – following his public conversion to Catholic emancipation – had received anything like such an emotive and popular send-off.⁵⁴ Typically, his critics again fastened on the theatricality of this staged departure. The Irish-born cartoonist John Doyle – ever an acidic commentator on the Whig-O'Connellite ménage – depicted a Dickensian quayside scene in which Normanby (in the persona of the departing Nicholas Nickleby) is embraced with studied theatricality by O'Connell as the impresario Vincent Crummles, while O'Connell's son John mimics his father with a nonplussed Lord Morpeth.⁵⁵

This would be a hard act to follow, and the choice of Normanby's successor was complicated by the multiplicity of roles expected of the appointee and by the difficulty of identifying a replacement who could combine these as effectively as he had done. Normanby's own inclinations leant towards the appointment of a 'decorative' viceroy, with the executive functions devolving more on the experienced team of Morpeth (who would be raised to cabinet rank) and Drummond, and he favoured the queen's uncle, the duke of Sussex. However, the cabinet was not persuaded of the suitability of a royal appointment, not least given the fury with which Normanby had been assailed in the Lords; Lord John Russell's elder brother, Lord Tavistock, declined the offer, as did the radical Lord Radnor. Although a number of names were discussed, in the end the appointment went to another active

'Foxite Whig' peer, Viscount Ebrington, who was keen for personal reasons to take the post. Russell had entertained some doubts concerning Ebrington's ability to withstand sustained political pressure, and even considered the abolition of the office at this juncture, but in the end acceded to the argument that this would ensure continuity.⁵⁶

The new viceroy's skills lay very much on the 'efficient' side of the scale; he was not personally charismatic and, despite a popular entry that echoed Mulgrave's in 1835, he lacked the almost automatic enthusiasm his predecessor had commanded.⁵⁷ Ebrington's political base was in Devon, but he was also an Irish landowner and had engaged in extensive back-channel negotiations with O'Connell in the previous years, and had fully approved Mulgrave's policy line.⁵⁸ He had a record for outspokenness on both the anti-slavery and Irish church questions, the latter immediately polarising opinion on him in the press and parliament.⁵⁹ Ebrington sought to maintain the same course, and was reinforced in this by Normanby's transfer to the home office in September 1839 after a mediocre spell as colonial secretary. The two worked closely together for the next two years, with Morpeth (now in the cabinet) serving as the third member of an unusually cohesive 'Irish' ministerial bloc.⁶⁰ The 'Liberator' expressed great reluctance to break with the government, but was under pressure from his own ranks to revivify the Repeal movement and prepare for what now appeared an inevitable return of the Conservatives to power.⁶¹ Despite his best efforts, and insistence that unlike the Chartists O'Connell could be won back through conciliation, Ebrington was eventually obliged in 1840 to proscribe Repealers from government patronage and saw his Irish popularity diminish as a consequence.⁶² The alliance held until 1841, but the 'popularity' that Normanby had attained proved ephemeral, as it was overly dependent both on the vagaries of individual personality as well as on a specific conjunction of political circumstances.

Despite this setback, and the further intensification of political antagonisms in Ireland associated with the full-blooded Repeal campaign of 1842-3, the Foxite Whigs were reluctant to abandon the liberal-unionist project of 'Justice to Ireland', and sought to revive it on returning to office, now with Russell as prime minister, in summer 1846. Again, the lord lieutenantcy was seen as crucial to the attempt, and Duncannon, who had succeeded as 4th earl of Bessborough in 1844, undertook the office, with a relatively inexperienced chief secretary (Henry Labouchere) and, for the first time in the office's history, an Irish Catholic under-secretary (Thomas Redington). He was the first viceroy with predominantly Irish connections or residency since the 2nd duke of Ormond in 1714, and the last until Abercorn in 1866 and Londonderry in 1886.

After the state trials of 1844 and his brief imprisonment, O'Connell was again prepared to suspend Repeal in favour of reform, and to engineer the expulsion of the radical firebrands of Young Ireland from his ranks in order to attain this. The long-standing personal bonds between the two men facilitated a serious attempt to return to the politics of Lichfield House, but in the context of Ireland in 1846–7 this proved illusory.⁶³ Against expectation, famine conditions intensified and the Irish government lost control over this vital area of policy to the ideologues at the Treasury. Reluctant despite his bitter frustration with the Whigs to break with Bessborough, O'Connell's health collapsed in early 1847 and he died en route to Rome in May. Increasingly politically isolated, and with his own health declining, Bessborough too expired on 16 May, a day after his old friend – he was only the second lord lieutenant, after Rutland sixty years before, to have died in office.⁶⁴

What appears extraordinary is the extent to which, despite the horrors of Irish mass mortality in the spring of 1847 – the very nadir of the Famine – Bessborough retained his personal popularity. Never a charismatic speaker or a theatrical personality, he was nevertheless well known to be the architect of the Irish reform strategy as well as one of the most sympathetic and generous of Irish landlords. The nationalist press, increasingly bitter about Whig 'betrayal' of Ireland in 1846–7, was careful to exempt him from responsibility; he had been 'thwarted and counteracted by the despotism of the Home Office, which . . . leaves no freedom of action to Lieutenant or Secretary', one Dublin paper observed, indeed he had 'struggled almost on his death bed to preserve the lives of the Irish people'. The provincial nationalist press agreed, with the *Galway Vindicator* praising him as 'a thorough Irishman in feeling and character', dedicated to 'promot[ing] the prosperity and welfare of Ireland'.⁶⁵ Eulogies came from O'Connell's son John in the Repeal Association and the provincial Catholic press, and were collected into a memorial volume.⁶⁶ Turning the realities of the viceregal office on its head, the author of the latter asserted that Bessborough's success had been due to the fact 'that his appointment appeared to be the unanimous election of a popular representative, rather than the nomination of a delegate of royal authority'.⁶⁷ According to the *Freeman's Journal*, the funeral cortege from the Castle to Kingsbridge Station was witnessed by a 'vast assemblage', all of whom 'seemed to feel the loss Ireland has sustained in the death of the excellent nobleman, who in life evinced the greatest desire to alleviate the distress which unhappily prevails in this country'.⁶⁸ The *Times* noted also the throngs of people who came to see the cortège arrive at Carlow by railway, and proceed onwards to Bessborough in his native County Kilkenny.⁶⁹

This funeral, with O'Connell's some weeks later, marked the end of the Foxite Whig experiment in Ireland. Always in two minds about the utility of

the lord lieutenantcy, Russell now decided to initiate the abolition of the office and opt for the integration of the Irish executive into the British through the substitution of a fourth secretary of state. Consequently, Morpeth – who actively sought the viceroyalty – was passed over for the 4th earl of Clarendon, a moderate Whig heavyweight with no previous Irish associations, who acceded on the express understanding that he would be the last viceroy, paving the way for an abolition bill as soon as practicable.⁷⁰ A royal visit to Ireland in August 1849, the first since George IV's brief stop in 1821, was intended to be the first of many, which would obviate the need for a resident viceroy to represent the monarch in Ireland.⁷¹ Although the abolition measure, when finally introduced in 1850, proved abortive, Clarendon's administration marked a sharp break with the recent past.⁷² Uninterested in personal or political popularity, he took a much harder line against Repealers, oversaw the return of coercive legislation in 1847–8 and, while privately appealing for additional relief expenditure in Ireland, was publicly associated with the regressive poor-law based policy that marked the latter years of the Famine, as well as the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill fiasco of 1850–1 which alienated the Catholic clergy. Lichfield House was well and truly buried with Bessborough.

What explains the relative success of Whig lords lieutenant in the 1835–47 period in attracting 'popularity' in Ireland, and what legacy did this leave, if any, in British-Irish relations? The Mulgrave viceroyalty partially coincided, and bore marked similarities to, what might be described as the 'first Victorian moment' in British-Irish relations. The accession to the throne in 1837 of the nineteen-year-old Princess Victoria, unsullied as she then was with the negative political associations that attached to her predecessors (and indeed to herself in later years), offered an opportunity for the expression of widespread popular royalism among Irish Catholics. As James Murphy has highlighted, O'Connell himself enthused on the innocence and grace of the new queen, and sought to utilise the emotional power of royalty to outflank Irish Protestant 'loyalism' and advance the reformist alliance.⁷³ The queen's despatch to Mulgrave in July 1837, expressing total confidence in his conduct and 'recognis[ing] in her Irish subjects a spirit of loyalty and devotion towards her person and government', which was widely reprinted in the Irish press, reinforced this.⁷⁴ In the absence of a royal visit to Ireland before 1849, the viceroy offered some local substitute for the glamour of a popular monarchy. While many incumbents offered only a pale shadow of the original, the Mulgraves excelled in playing the part. Lady Mulgrave's place as one of the (controversially partisan) ladies of the royal bedchamber, and the status of the couple as royal favourites in Victoria's early years, no doubt enhanced this association.

Mulgrave proved himself a skilled practitioner of the politics of symbol and gesture, to a much greater extent than he was able to master a

departmental brief after 1839. The importance of the theatrical and charismatic aspects of public politics in explaining the success of O'Connell's extraordinary mass mobilisations in this era has recently been investigated by Gary Owens.⁷⁵ Mulgrave was perhaps unique among nineteenth-century viceroys in his ability to echo O'Connell's political flourishes and harness the Irish popular movement (if briefly) to the carriage of British reforming politics. Although aspiring to the full political integration of Ireland within the Union, Russell grasped the benefits of Mulgrave's style at a crucial point in its evolution; he told the lord lieutenant in 1838,

You have now established a name and an influence in Ireland, which is in itself a power, . . . in a country where the elements of government are so much wanting, and are only beginning to operate beneficially.⁷⁶

In short, Mulgrave had dramatised the state as symbolically embodied in Ireland by the viceroy, as an entity quite distinct from and even at odds with the traditional elites which had previously dominated Dublin Castle and its court. The idea of a 'neutral' (or as his Conservative critics insisted, a pro-Catholic) state was thus popularised, creating a political space in which liberal Catholics and constitutional nationalists could act or aspire to participate.

For their part, large numbers of the Irish public responded with some enthusiasm to the Whig olive branch. One striking physical manifestation of this is the 'Morpeth Testimonial Roll' of June 1841, a huge document signed by up to 300,000 individuals and presented to the outgoing chief secretary in gratitude for his efforts for Irish reform since 1835. The creation of the document, pieced together from sheets sent in by local committees from many parts of the country, was undertaken by a body headed by the Whig duke of Leinster, but with the active cooperation of the O'Connellite political machine and with support from much of the Catholic parochial clergy.⁷⁷ Despite this manifestation, Morpeth's rather half-hearted attempt to revive his personal popularity in Ireland when he returned as lord lieutenant in 1855 (having succeeded as 7th earl of Carlisle in 1848), was not successful. Although genial and good-natured, in the very different post-Famine conditions of the 1850s, this was not enough, and any return to the viceregal politics of the 1830s proved impossible.⁷⁸

Both the meliorist optimism of Foxite Whiggery and the demotic response accorded to the theatrical populism of Mulgrave, and the more restrained (and less polarising) reforming paternalism of Ebrington and Bessborough, owed something to the romantic cultural context in which it was played out. It is perhaps fitting that the last word here should go to the high priest of Irish sentimental romanticism, Tom Moore – who was also an acute

political observer. Writing for a liberal public periodical in 1838, Moore declared that the Mulgrave administration had brought a new dawn to Ireland, principally due to his personal impact:

His progresses through the provinces in the first year scattered the seeds of social improvement wide; the people received with open hearts and arms the first Lieutenant who presented the majesty of the law in its attractive attributes, and showed them the crown of Protestant Britain adorned with its best jewel. In the southern counties, long unaccustomed to those mild qualities in which the true force of government resides, his reception was enthusiastic; the insurgent delivered up his pike – the incendiary quenched his brand – the demagogue renounced his frantic projects: the founder of the dispensation of clemency and justice was hailed with the due honours of a patron and deliverer, wherever he bent his steps.⁷⁹

While overstated for effect, and ignoring both the vulnerability of the achievement and the negative consequences of political polarisation, Moore's comments are a useful reminder of the importance of viceregal style and of the possibility, at least, of a popular lord lieutenancy, at least prior to the calamities of 1847.

Notes

- 1 For a Tory attack on the institution (as well as its 1835–9 incumbent), see [David Robinson], 'What is the use of a lord-lieutenant of Ireland?', *Fraser's Magazine*, 13 (Apr. 1836), pp 475–87.
- 2 *Freeman's Journal* (hereafter *FJ*), 12 May 1835, *Northern Whig* (hereafter *NW*), 14 May 1835.
- 3 *Times*, 14 May 1835; *Morning Chronicle* (hereafter *MC*), 14 May 1835.
- 4 *Times*, 14 May 1835; *MC*, 21 May 1835; *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 3, vol. 27, cols 1,118–25 (15 May 1835); vol. 28, cols 1–14 (22 May 1835).
- 5 O'Connell had attended Castle levees in the early years of both Wellesley's and Anglesey's first administrations in 1821–2 and 1828 respectively, but this was not sustained once the early optimism about Catholic emancipation had receded, Joseph Robins, *Champagne and Silver Buckles: The Viceregal Court at Dublin Castle, 1700–1922* (Dublin, 2001), pp 105–6, 112.
- 6 [Anon.], 'Earl Mulgrave in Ireland', *Dublin Review*, 1: 1 (May 1836), pp 28–46.
- 7 For a full discussion, see Peter Mandler, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals 1830–1852* (Oxford, 1990); Peter Gray, *Famine, Land and Politics: British Government and Irish Society 1843–50* (Dublin, 1999), pp 17–22. For the case that Mulgrave's policy embodied the spirit of Charles James Fox's aspirations, see [Edward Berwick], 'Lord Mulgrave's speech on the state of Ireland', *Edinburgh Review*, 66 (Jan. 1838), pp 457–8.
- 8 O'Connell to Duncannon, 28 Apr. 1835, West Sussex Record Office, Chichester (hereafter

- WSRO), Bessborough Papers, F.201; O'Connell to FitzPatrick, 21 Apr. 1835, O'Connell to Ellice, 11 May 1835, in M. R. O'Connell (ed.), *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell* (7 vols, Dublin, 1972–80), v., pp 293–5, 303–6.
- 9 *Times*, 12 Oct. 1835, 14 Jan. 1837, Melbourne to Mulgrave, 10, 19 Oct. 1835, Mulgrave Castle, N. Yorkshire (hereafter MuC), Normanby Papers, MM/48–49; Russell to Melbourne, 24 Oct. 1835, Southampton University Library (hereafter SUL), Broadlands (Melbourne) Papers, MEL/RU/11/1–2; Anon., *A Letter to the Earl of Mulgrave, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. By a Dissatisfied Country Gentleman* (Dublin, 1836); James H. Murphy, *Abject Loyalty: Nationalism and Monarchy in Ireland during the Reign of Queen Victoria* (Washington DC, 2001), pp 14, 22–3.
- 10 The epithet 'O'Mulgrave' was heavily employed in satirical commentary on the viceroy's relations with O'Connell, see *The Age*, 17, 24 May 1835, etc.
- 11 O'Connell to Bessborough, 30 Nov. 1834, WSRO, Bessborough Papers, F.201.
- 12 For a study of John Doyle's satirical swipes on the Whig-O'Connell entente (as 'HB'), which frequently depicted Mulgrave as the dupe or flunky of the self-promoting Irish leader, see J. N. McCord, 'The image in England', in M. R. O'Connell (ed.), *Daniel O'Connell: Political Pioneer* (Dublin, 1991), pp 57–71.
- 13 O'Connell to Duncannon, 26, 30 Nov., 17 Dec. 1834, WSRO, Bessborough Papers, F.201.
- 14 K. Theodore Hoppert, 'John William Ponsonby', in *Dictionary of Irish Biography* (hereafter *DIB*) [www.dib.cambridge.org/view/ReadPage.do?articleId=a7416]
- 15 Richard Davenport-Hines, 'Constantine Henry Phipps, first marquess of Normanby', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter *ODNB*) [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22187]
- 16 *Examiner*, 5 May 1832. Contrast the view of one reviewer that he was 'the Froissart of fashion' with Disraeli's snide critique, [Anon.], 'Living literary characters (No. IX): the earl of Mulgrave', *New Monthly Magazine*, 32 (July 1831), pp 249–53, [Benjamin Disraeli], 'Gallery of literary characters, no. LXVI. Earl of Mulgrave', *Fraser's Magazine*, 12 (Nov. 1835), pp 540–1.
- 17 *MC*, 7 Apr. 1832, *Times*, 4 Apr. 1835.
- 18 *FJ*, 5 Jan., 21 Feb. 1837.
- 19 Brian Jenkins, *Era of Emancipation: British Government of Ireland, 1812–1830* (Kingston and Montreal, 1988), pp 186–7; *Hansard*, 3, vol. 27, col. 151 (23 Mar. 1835)
- 20 *Dublin Evening Post*, cited in *Examiner*, 24 May 1835; see also *ibid.*, 5 July 1835.
- 21 Henry Heaney (ed.), *A Scottish Whig in Ireland, 1835–1838: The Irish Journals of Robert Graham of Redgorton* (Dublin, 1999), p. 21.
- 22 Mulgrave to Russell, 15 Mar. 1836, The National Archives, Kew (hereafter TNA), Russell Papers, PRO30/22/2A, fols 207–303; *FJ*, 18 Mar. 1837. None of this was new in itself – Richmond had insisted on Irish-made regalia, Wellesley had shamrocks impressed on his livery buttons and had revived Bedford's innovation of celebrating St Patrick's Day, and Anglesey had ordered the playing of Irish airs on public occasions – the difference lay in the extent to which the Mulgraves succeeded in winning over and keeping mass public support in Ireland, Edward Brynn, *Crown and Castle: British Rule in Ireland 1800–30* (Dublin, 1978), pp 101–2, 106.
- 23 Robins, *Champagne and Silver Buckles*, p. 99; Brynn, *Crown and Castle*, p. 106.

- 24 John Ferguson McLennan, *Memoir of Thomas Drummmond: Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1835 to 1840* (Edinburgh, 1867); R. Barry O'Brien, *Thomas Drummmond: Under-secretary in Ireland, 1835–40: Life and Letters* (London, 1889). See also M. A. G. Ó Tuathaigh, *Thomas Drummmond and the Government of Ireland, 1835–41* (Dublin, 1978).
- 25 McLennan claimed that 'men like Mulgrave and Morpeth were incapable of feeling, even for a moment, the power of inward impulse to action which regulated Drummmond's whole life', *Memoir*, p. 250. Interestingly, Drummmond's portrait was still on public display in the public rooms of Áras an Uachtaráin (the former Viceregal Lodge) in 2009, a rare survival from the colonial era in an official building of the Republic of Ireland.
- 26 Russell saw Mulgrave's course as essentially that of giving real effect to the 1829 Catholic Relief Act, and 'destroying extreme parties by shewing them how well they are to be treated under a just Government', Russell to Mulgrave, 5 Aug. 1836, MuC, Normanby Papers, M/835.
- 27 W. F. Wakefield (ed.), *Addresses Presented to His Excellency the Earl of Mulgrave, from the Different Parts of Ireland, During the Years 1835 and 1836, with His Excellency's Answers* (Dublin, 1836), p. 3; MC, 23 May 1835.
- 28 NW, 1 Oct. 1835.
- 29 NW, 26 Oct. 1835. While the visit was largely stage-managed by Belfast's middle-class liberals, demotic support was expressed in several places, including at the viceregal couple's tour of the model damask factory at Ardoyne; a more hostile Protestant crowd hissed at them at Sandy Row, *ibid.*, 29 Oct. 1835.
- 30 Wakefield (ed.), *Addresses*, pp 93–5, 215–16. This image was enhanced by the presence in the viceregal household of John Mulgrave, a freed slave, who died in Dublin Castle in 1838.
- 31 Brynna, *Crown and Castle*, p. 106.
- 32 Peter Gray, *The Making of the Irish Poor Law, 1815–43* (Manchester, 2009), pp 160–1.
- 33 NW, 2 Nov. 1835; FJ, 29 Aug. 1836; Wakefield (ed.), *Addresses*, p. 339–40, 351–6.
- 34 *Times*, 29 Aug. 1836.
- 35 Mulgrave to Russell, 11 Aug. 1836, TNA, Russell Papers PRO30/22/2B, fols 302–4.
- 36 *Dublin Evening Mail*, repr. in *Times*, 13 Sept. 1838.
- 37 *Examiner*, 8 Nov. 1835.
- 38 *Times*, 16 Aug. 1836.
- 39 FJ, 29 Aug. 1836.
- 40 [M. W. Savagel], *Ireland under Lord Mulgrave* (2nd edn, London, 1837), p. 16.
- 41 Mulgrave to Melbourne, 15 Feb. 1837, Royal Archives, Windsor (hereafter RA) [microfilm], Melbourne Papers, 100/20; this was contested, see *Times*, 24 Dec. 1839.
- 42 Melbourne to Russell, 3 Feb. 1837, SUL, Broadlands (Melbourne) Papers, MEL/RU/303.
- 43 Anon., *The Female Angler. To which are added Earl Mulgrave's Welcome to Waterford* (Waterford, [1835]). For a more sedate poetic appreciation of Mulgrave, see Anon., *Farewell: Being a Poem, Commemorative of the Administration of the Noble the Marquis of Normanby in Ireland. By a Lady* (Dublin, 1839).
- 44 Wakefield (ed.), *Addresses*, pp 72–5, 85–6.
- 45 *Times*, 25 Jan. 1839.
- 46 See for example Russell to Mulgrave, 25 Nov. 1836, MuC, Normanby Papers, M/846.

- 47 For the religious breakdown of Irish appointments in 1835–6, see [Anon.], 'Ireland and her calumniators', *Dublin Review*, 2: 4 (Apr. 1837), p. 434.
- 48 See Mulgrave to Drummond, Oct. 1836, in O'Brien, *Drummond*, p. 237; Oliver MacDonald, *The Emancipist: Daniel O'Connell, 1830–47* (London, 1989), pp 127–31.
- 49 *Hansard*, 3, vol. 39, col. 247 (27 Nov. 1837).
- 50 Drummond to the Tipperary magistrates, 22 May 1838, in O'Brien (ed.), *Drummond*, pp 276–87.
- 51 Normanby to Melbourne, 28 July 1838, RA, Melbourne Papers, 100/83; *Hansard*, 3, vol. 46, cols 974–1,012 (21 Mar. 1839). Normanby's promotion, part of the coronation honours of 1838, was in reward for remaining so long in the viceroyalty, Melbourne to Russell, 3, 4 June 1838, SUL, Broadlands (Melbourne) Papers, MEL/RU/492–3.
- 52 Normanby to Russell, 29 July 1838, TNA, Russell Papers, PRO30/22/3B, fols 230–5.
- 53 *NW*, 19 Feb., *Times*, 19 Feb., *Examiner*, 24 Feb. 1839.
- 54 Brynn, *Crown and Castle*, p. 108.
- 55 'HB' (John Doyle), 'A leaf out of Nicholas Nickleby with slight variations: Nicholas quits the company – theatrical emotion of Mr Vincent Crummles', cartoon published in London, 26 Mar. 1839.
- 56 Normanby to Russell, 6 Sept. 1838, TNA, Russell Papers, PRO30/22/3B, fols 273–9; Russell to Mulgrave, 17, 28 Oct. 1838, MuC, Normanby Papers, M/922, 923; Normanby to Melbourne, 12 Feb. 1839, RA, Melbourne Papers, 101/19; Tavistock to Ebrington, 28 Feb. 1839, Devon Record Office, Exeter (hereafter DRO), Fortescue Papers, 1262M/L/17.
- 57 See for example the polite but rather guarded welcome in *FJ*, 2 Mar. 1839; for the entry, see *Belfast Newsletter*, 9 Apr. 1839.
- 58 Ebrington to Mulgrave, 29 Oct. 1835, Morpeth to Mulgrave, 30 Oct. 1835, MuC, Normanby Papers, M/156, 490, Ebrington to O'Connell, 9 Dec. 1838, DRO, Fortescue Papers, 1262M/FC/94.
- 59 *NW*, 5, 9 Mar. 1839; *Hansard*, 3, vol. 45, cols 1,144–62 (4 Mar. 1839)
- 60 Ebrington to Normanby, 13 Aug. 1839, MuC, Normanby Papers, V/159; O'Connell was again entertained at the viceregal lodge, Ebrington to Normanby, 10 Jan. 1840, *ibid.*, V/166.
- 61 O'Connell to Ebrington, 3 Jan. 1839, DRO, Fortescue Papers, 1262M/L/1; Ebrington to Russell, 8 Sept. 1839, TNA, Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3D, fols 23–6.
- 62 Ebrington to Normanby, 8 Sept. 1840, DRO, Fortescue Papers, 1262M/L/160; *FJ*, 12 June, 24 Sept., 13 Oct. 1840.
- 63 For this period, see Gray, *Famine, Land and Politics*, pp 142–51.
- 64 *Ibid.*, pp 163–8.
- 65 *FJ*, 18, 21 May 1847.
- 66 Anon., *Notices of the Viceroyalty of the late Earl of Besborough* (Dublin, 1847). In death, as in life, the viceregal ritual was organised with due pomp and ceremony by the Ulster king at arms, *FJ*, 19 May 1847.
- 67 *Notices*, p. 7.
- 68 *FJ*, 22 May 1847.

- 69 *Times*, 24 May 1847.
- 70 Morpeth to Russell, 2 May 1847; Russell, Memo on the post of Irish viceroy [May 1847], TNA, Russell Papers, PRO30/22/6C, fols 211–12, 6H, fols 372–3.
- 71 James Loughlin, 'Allegiance and illusion: Queen Victoria's Irish visit of 1849', *History*, 87 (2002), pp 491–513.
- 72 For the 1850 Bill in its context, see Peter Gray, "'Ireland's last fetter struck off': the lord lieutenant debate 1800–67", in Terence McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2005), pp 87–101.
- 73 Murphy, *Object Loyalty*, pp 20–31.
- 74 *NW*, 25 July 1837.
- 75 Gary Owens, 'Visualising the Liberator: self-fashioning, dramaturgy, and the construction of Daniel O'Connell', *Éire-Ireland*, 33–4 (1998), pp 103–30; 'Nationalism without words: symbolism and ritual behaviour in the Repeal "Monster Meetings" of 1843–5', in James S. Donnelly and Kerby A. Miller (eds), *Irish Popular Culture, 1650–1850* (Dublin, 1998), pp 242–70.
- 76 Russell to Normanby, 27 July 1838, TNA, Russell Papers, PRO30/22/3B, fols 215–16.
- 77 The Testimonial, which is part of the Castle Howard archives, is currently being conserved and interpreted at the National University of Ireland (hereafter NUI), Maynooth, see Patrick Cosgrove, 'The 1841 testimonial to Lord Morpeth: a remarkable new source for pre-Famine Ireland', (unpublished paper, NUI Maynooth, 2010).
- 78 Carlisle spent much of his vicerealty promoting schemes of 'improvement' in education, the arts and agricultural development. These themes dominate the commemorative volume edited by J. J. Gaskin, *The Vice Regal Speeches and Addresses, Lectures and Poems of the Late Earl of Carlisle* (Dublin, 1865).
- 79 [Thomas Moore], 'Ireland', *Monthly Chronicle*, 2 (1839), pp 31–9.